

Lawrence Kolb's Interview of Sándor Lorand

This electronic document is derived¹ from a photocopy of the "edited, revised and enlarged" typewriter transcription of a videotaped interview of the pioneering psychoanalyst Sandor Lorand conducted by Lawrence Kolb in 1963.

Stapled to the 30-page photocopy is a typed page (not a photocopy) with Sándor Lorand's signature following the handwritten inscription "to my favorite nephew with love", as well as a date (April 2, 1978) penned beneath an indecipherable word. A photocopy of this additional page is included in this electronic document.

According to Josh Levy, III, the historian of science and technology at Library of Congress Manuscript Division the original "edited, revised and enlarged" transcription is held in a folder marked "Interview, 1963" in Box 1, Sándor Lorand Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.²

Scholars may find it convenient to study the below electronic rendering online. The Library of Congress itself is not yet able to offer an electronic copy. The document transcribed here from a photocopy may have been further revised under the guidance of Dr. Lorand beyond what is available at the Library of Congress. It bears some handwritten editorial marks that correct typographical errors. The photocopy was among papers left by the late Theodore Weinberger, the "favorite nephew" mentioned above.

Born on December 2, 1892, Dr. Lorand would have been 70 years old at the time of Dr. Kolb's interview and 84 when he apparently gifted the instant material to his nephew. He died at age 95 on July 30, 1987.

We have tried to reproduce the material here as received, including its page placement, line breaks, typographical errors and punctuation.

A pdf file of the photocopy is available separately.

At least one citation of the material in the Library of Congress has been published.³

¹ Prepared on October 1, 2022 by Myron L. Pulier, MD. pulierml@njms.rutgers.edu .

² Personal correspondence, January 10, 2022.

³ "Lorand, Sándor (1893-1987) ." *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*. Retrieved September 23, 2021 from Encyclopedia.com: <https://www.encyclopedia.com/psychology/dictionaries-thesauruses-pictures-and-press-releases/lorand-sandor-1893-1987>

*March
April 3, 1978*

*to my friend
with
love Sandor*

The following is an edited, revised and enlarged
version of an interview with Dr. Sandor Lorand by
Dr. Lawrence Kolb, Professor and Chairman of the
Psychiatric Department of Columbia University,
video-taped in 1963 for the Archives of the University.

The original text is deposited in The Library of Congress.

The following is an edited, revised and enlarged version of an interview with Dr. Sandor Lorand by Dr. Lawrence Kolb, Professor and Chairman of the Psychiatric Department of Columbia University, video-taped in 1963 for the Archives of the University.

The following is a curriculum vitae of Dr. Sandor Lorand (video-taped) made by the Psychiatric Institute of Columbia University in New York City. Dr. Lorand was interviewed by Professor and Chairman of the Psychiatric Department, Dr. Lawrence C. Kolb.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

This interview with Dr. Lorand is one of a series with distinguished psychiatrists in this country. Doctor Lorand is Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry at the Downstate University, where he organized and directed the Division of Psychoanalytic Education. He's here with me today.

He was born in Hungary in 1893. He received his medical education in Hungary and came to the United States in 1925 with a special visa to enter the country. He was invited to the New York State Psychiatric Hospital (Ward Island) by the director, Professor Kirby, who was a member of the small group of psychoanalysts. Doctor Lorand was invited at the suggestion of A.A. Brill, who was the President of the New York Psychoanalytic Society, to teach and lecture in psychoanalysis and psychiatry, having been trained in Budapest by Sandor Ferenczi. Since his arrival in August 1925, he pursued a career of great distinction, advancing psychoanalytic and psychiatric education. With the development of psychoanalytic education in universities in this country, Dr Lorand has fostered these beginnings in New York at the State University of New York, Downstate Medical Center, where he founded the Division of Psychoanalytic Education, the first psychoanalytic institute in medical school.

For a period of thirteen years he served at the Mount Sinai Hospital in Manhattan, and also at that time and later was most important in the development of the Hillside Hospital as a member of their Board of Trustees and as President of their Medical Board.

At this time I shall ask Dr. Lorand to tell us the story of his beginning interest in medicine, psychiatry and psychoanalysis as he wishes.

DR. LORAND

I studied and finished my medical studies at the Royal Hungarian University in Budapest where I received my absolutorium. Before I received my diploma, the so-called "white terror" started in Hungary. The Rumanian army invaded the country to suppress communism and there was a suspension of university rights for radicals and Jews. Being of the Jewish faith, I left and went to Czechoslovakia (that part of Hungary which was annexed after the First World War from Hungary). I was born there. The Czechs granted me a diploma on the basis of my completed studies. They wanted physicians to settle there. I immediately obtained a position in the psychiatric hospital in Kosice.

Mazaryk was the President of the Czechoslovak Republic and the new republic was sponsored by the United States. (Mazaryk's wife was a sister of President Wilson.) Without knowing a word of the Czech language I became assistant to Dr. Stuchlik, a pupil of Jung who was head of the psychiatric hospital. He later became Professor of Psychiatry at the University in Prague.

Concerning my early interests in medicine and psychiatry: at about the age of ten or eleven, I remember fantasizing about becoming a veterinarian because I liked animals. My father and grandfather were gentlemen farmers and I grew up on a farm. I recall riding in the saddle with my father out in the fields at the age of five. Later in adolescence, however, I decided to become a physician and treat people rather than animals.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

What made you change?

DR. LORAND:

It happened probably as a result of moving to the city to continue my studies and getting away from the farm. It was quite a long stretch until I got to medical school. It was with difficulty that I finally got there. I had to complete my gymnasium studies which would compare to high school in America and part of college. During the last four years of gymnasium I also attended a theological seminary, where , in deference to my mother's wish, I studied Hebrew. I was the youngest of six boys and two girls. Being the favorite of both parents, I naturally wanted to please them. This meant complying with my mother's request that I remain for a few years and study theology. When I was ready to start medical school I still could not tear away suddenly. So for two years I stayed on in the department of theology. The theological seminary required that I study as well oriental languages at the department of philosophy in order to receive my doctorate in philosophy. My teacher of philosophy was Bernard Alexander from whom I received an excellent introduction to Kant and to modern philosophy. I studied Egyptian hieroglyphics with Professor Mahler, Arabic with Goldzieher, the famous orientalist, and Persian history and Greek.

After spending two years in theology, I knew that sooner or later I would transfer to medical school. In fact during those two years I also studied physics and chemistry.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

Did this period in which you studied theology have some influence in directing you towards psychiatry and analysis?

DR. LORAND

It influenced me later in my career when I dealt with religion psychology about which I have written. The two years of study of chemistry and physics aided my plan to start medical studies.

I made application to the department of medicine and received credit for the two years' study of chemistry and physics. In fact I received an entire year's credit in medical school due to the fact that in the middle European medical schools the first two years of study are physics, chemistry, physiology and anatomy. Therefore the only subjects I had to make up were physiology and anatomy in the following year. So instead of spending five years in medical school, I was able to fulfill the requirements in four. In addition, I received credit for serving in the army during the first world war.

Part of my medical studies fell in the First World War period. In the beginning of August, 1914, I had to go to war and was in the army until the end of the war. Luckily, I wasn't out in the field much. I was in army hospitals behind the front line.

After many months in field hospitals, I returned to Budapest. I was assigned to a war hospital where there were about 700 wounded and shell-shocked soldiers.

I worked together there with a neurologist, Dr. Ehrenthal. Knowing that I was interested in psychology, he told me to try to treat shell shock patients with hypnosis and I began to dabble on my own with hypnosis. I had much success with using it with patients and I became quite a hypnotist. I served the last two years of my duties at this hospital in Budapest which enabled me to continue my medical studies.

This was in September, 1918 just at the end of the World War. The International Psychoanalytic Congress was starting in Budapest. Freud attended it. It was really a gala occasion as Congresses go because the city, the mayor of the city, were hosts. The Congress was held in the Academy of Sciences. Congress members were treated royally. They had a boat on the Danube at their disposal for excursions. Banquets were held one after another. At this Congress, Freud first talked about the technical innovations of Ferenczi. In a paper "Turning in the Ways of Psychoanalytic Therapy", he also made the declaration that Budapest from now on was the center of psychoanalysis because at that Congress the Austrian, German and Budapest analysts reported their results of psychoanalytic therapy of war neurosis. The three governments went so far planning to establish psychoanalytic clinics for the treatment of soldiers.

That was September, and in October the war was over. The revolution came.

This was the memorable Congress which impressed me to the extent that I decided to become a psychoanalyst. My friend Feldman, who is now in Rochester, also became more interested in analysis.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

Did you think then of personal analysis?

DR. LORAND:

Definitely, but I had to postpone it for awhile. At the end of 1918, I contacted Ferenczi on account of his book on war neurosis which he edited. It contained Simmel's, Jone's, Ferenczi's and Abraham's contribution to the psychotherapy of the treatment of war neurosis.

I discussed then with Ferenczi my personal analysis in the near future. At that time, I remained in Budapest waiting to receive my diploma. However, it was constantly delayed because of the political situation. So I returned to Czechoslovakia where I secured a job and received my diploma there. By this time I was partly settled in Kosice (Czechoslovakia), a city two hours from Budapest. I continued traveling to Budapest to see my parents and friends, and also contacting Ferenczi although not for analysis yet.

This was the end of 1920. I worked at the psychiatric hospital in Kosice with Dr. Stuchlich. That city had about sixty-thousand inhabitants, and about one hundred-fifty very enlightened physicians who were there from the Hungarian regime which was taken over by

Czechoslovakia. In the name of our medical society I invited Ferenczi to visit us and give us some lectures on the therapy of war neurosis. He graciously consented. He already was a big name in Budapest. That was 1921. He gave two lectures, one for physicians and one for the laity. That evening, I remember, we had a big banquet in his honor. There was music, dancing and wine, all of which Ferenczi enjoyed. He was a man who loved life.

Before he returned to Budapest, Ferenczi said to me (referring to my plan to go into psychoanalysis), "You did successful therapy research with hypnotic delivery. Come up to Budapest for a few months. Perhaps you will like it and become a well-trained psychotherapist. If not, you won't have missed anything."

I discussed the matter with my chief, Dr. Stuchlich, who had been analyzed by Jung. He urged me to go ahead with my plan to be analyzed and offered me a vacation. I went to Budapest in the spring of 1923 to be analyzed, having got some money together. (One paid with dollars at that time in Budapest.) I expected to be there six or seven months or so. However, I was there nine months, and had analytic sessions five times weekly. It was considered a long analysis at that time.

During the last two months I had two sessions per day, one in the morning and one in the afternoon because there was still work to do. The analysis was a difficult but interesting experience.

In the spring of 1924, after my analysis, I returned to Czechoslovakia. But then found that Kosice was too small for me. I always liked to work in clinics and was always connected with hospitals and clinics. We had a marvelous obstetrical clinic in Kosice. The head of it was Dr. Frankenstein, a brilliant gynecologist with whom we used to make rounds.

Stuchlich, Dr. Frankenstein and I used to make early rounds in the psychiatric hospital in the gynecological clinic. It was there I conducted the interesting experiment with painless delivery in hypnosis. This was after reading Friedlander's experiment in Holland. (We also performed curettages and minor operations.) I successfully led some primiperas through their pregnancies and deliveries. I published the experiments, now out in a second translation in English. This was my psychotherapeutic work in 1921-22 when I was an attending in the gynecological clinic.

I finished my analysis in the spring of 1924 and then terminated my job in the hospital where I had worked for nearly three years.

In 1924 an important political event took place. King Karl, the deposed Hungarian King, came back to Hungary, which was already a republic. The Little Entente consisting of Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, mobilized their army against the Hungarian army to stop Karl from coming back. At this time I was considered a Czech citizen, which I was not. I had to go into the army for three days. Then the crisis of mobilization ended.

In the spring of 1925 I saw Ferenczi and mentioned to him that I would like to go to America, a move I had discussed in my analysis. He said, "I was hoping you would be a liaison between Czechoslovakia and Hungary and you would establish psychoanalysis there. Why do you want to leave?" "I cannot see a peaceful life here in the future" was my reply.

Ferenczi helped me as he had promised. He wrote to A.A. Brill in New York, telling him about me and my wish to come to America. Dr. Brill contacted Professor Kirby, the Director of the New York State Psychiatric Hospital on Ward's Island. Kirby was a charter member of the small New York psychoanalysts' group. Within a few weeks' time Brill received confirmation from Kirby that I could come as Kirby had secured a position for me.

Within a short time I received a letter from the American Consulate in Budapest asking me to appear at the office where I was notified of having been granted a special immigration visa number to immigrate to the United States. My wife was not included in the permit. She followed me a few months later. (Immigration to America was closed from 1920 to early 1930.)

I received my visa to come to the United States in the spring of 1925, but I decided to spend some time in Vienna before leaving for the states. I contacted my friend, Professor Schilder who was a professor at the time. I spent two months with him at the Wagner-Jaureg Psychiatric Clinic in Vienna. I took a refresher course concentrating in psychiatry on the new malaria treatment of syphilitic patients.

At the end of August, 1925, I arrived in New York. Brill was on vacation. I was waiting until he came back in September before starting my job at the Manhattan State Hospital.

Meanwhile, I visited a Hungarian physician at the Central Neurological Hospital on Welfare Island and I met the superintendent, Dr. Price. He was a very friendly and nice man, and he invited me to join the medical staff at the hospital, offering a paid position. I thanked him and accepted his offer with reservation thinking of my obligation to the promised job at Manhattan State. However, he asked me to start the malaria treatment at the clinic.

When Brill came back in September, he said, "I have a position for you at the Psychiatric Institute." I told him I was sorry and that for the time being I was involved in treating malaria of syphilitic patients on Welfare Island. Dr. Burns, a professor from Fordham Medical School was the chief neurologist, and Neustadter was his assistant at the clinic.

I stayed a few months at the Central Neurological Hospital and was lecturing on psychoanalysis at the Manhattan State Hospital. After five months, Central Neurological appointed me Visiting Psychiatrist. I moved to the city and began to study for my State Boards. I took the medical part after three months and passed, but failed physiology and chemistry at the first try. In time I was awarded my diploma. During the time I was working towards it I practiced analytic therapy. Brill had sent me a few cases.

In 1927 after I passed my State Boards, I met Dr. Israel Strauss, Chief of the Neuro-Psychiatric Department at Mount Sinai Hospital. I accepted his offer to join Mount Sinai and became chief of one clinic. There were three sections and three chiefs. The other two were Monroe Meyer and Dudley Schoenfeld. Dr. Clarence Oberndorf was the Attending Psychiatrist for the hospital. I was also appointed lecturer at Columbia University. The psychiatrists taking post-graduate courses at Columbia attended my lectures which were on dynamic psychiatry in psychotherapy and the use of hypnotic suggestion.

At first Strauss was rigidly opposed to acceptance of psychoanalytic theory. Gradually, however, he became convinced of its therapeutic validity. His attitude gradually changed during the course of our monthly neurological conferences, where a number of psychoneurotic patients were presented and the psychotherapeutic approach to their problems was consistently delineated to a large medical audience. The acceptance of analytically derived knowledge became, nonetheless, a topic of continuing controversy between the neurologists and psychiatrists.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

Had Dr. Strauss much to do with the development of Hillside?

DR. LORAND:

He certainly did. He was one of the founders of the hospital. Strauss was an exceptional physician. He was the initiator of Hillside and responsible for its growing reputation. When I joined the Hillside Medical Board, it had a director, Dr. Louis Wender and two residents, Dr. Samuel Atkin and Dr. Leo Rachlin. The three psychiatrists took care of the twelve patients then at the hospital.

Strauss was eminently fair and after a while was so impressed with the therapeutic results that he sent two of his neurological residents, Dr. William Needles and Dr. Paul Goolker to me to be psychoanalyzed. Strauss and I became very good friends and he frequently sought my advice in psychotherapeutic problems. He was very gratified that I had come to settle in America whereas other Europeans came for a short time, and not finding America to their liking, left. Among them were Adler, Rank, Federn and Ferenczi.

The mental health clinics at Mount Sinai and Hillside became unique teaching centers for psychotherapy as a result of Strauss' interest and drive. Dr. Strauss' friend, Leon Lowenstein was the early financial backer of Hillside . With their combined persistence and enthusiasm they gathered a following of financiers and psychiatrists. Among them was A.A. Brill who became an important supporter of the Hillside Hospital.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

Did you enjoy your contact with Brill?

DR. LORAND

Very much indeed. Brill was a grand person, friendly and helpful to everyone. He was my mentor and primarily responsible for my coming to the United States. Ferenczi referred to him as Freud's appointed envoy of

psychoanalysis to America. Ferenczi considered Jones to be the envoy appointed by Freud to represent psychoanalysis in England, as Ferenczi felt himself to be the representative in Hungary.

A.A. Brill was the President when I met him in 1925. I found him full of energy and at work disseminating information and preparing the ground for the understanding of psychoanalysis by everyone, i.e. the medical profession, lay people, teachers, lawyers and nurses. He enrolled me along with three or four others who gave lectures at various psychiatrists' offices, including his own, rented hotel rooms and at the homes of interested friends. Brill was an ardent teacher.

I was happy to be of help and so were a number of other analysts. In the coming years I was to side with Brill on many occasions in his constructive efforts to gradually develop the New York Psychoanalytic Society, which eventually attained a leading position in the American Psychoanalytic Association.

A different attitude existed in New York towards psychoanalysis from that of Europe where rigid antagonism was prevalent. In New York the Psychoanalytic Society was an informal, club-like organization, whose members included physicians and psychiatrists who were friends of analysts, but the majority of whom were not analyzed. The Society did not have regularly scheduled meetings, nor was there an official meeting place as I indicated. I gather from Lewin's reminiscences (1962) that from 1911 up to 1925, there were no notable changes in the Society's structure.

In the autumn of 1925 when I joined the psychoanalytic group, there was an active exchange of ideas among the younger analysts who had recently returned from Europe where they had been analyzed. They all participated in building the scientific reputation of psychoanalysis.

At Brill's insistence, formal organization within the Society began in 1925. Regularly scheduled meetings were held at the Academy of Medicine.

A critical situation developed in October, 1925 when the Bad-Homburg report was presented at the Society. It contained the decisions of the proceedings of the International Psychoanalytic Association's Congress which decided to standardize training of psychoanalysts on the basis of what had been established in London, Berlin, Vienna and Budapest. Brill, as usual, had a difficult time keeping peace.

Oberndorf and some members of the New York Society objected to the new requirements that future members be analyzed. Some members felt that compulsory analysis was inadvisable and that the decision to undergo personal analysis should be left to the discretion, interest or desire of the individual physician. According to this view, personal analysis was to be optional and not under the auspices of the institutes and their educational committees. There was disagreement about who should analyze the candidates who sought analysis. Arguments took place as to what analysts should select to teach about theory and technique.

Freud's newly published works, The Ego and the Id (1923) and Inhibitions, Symptom and Anxiety (1926) gave rise to debates about the meaning of the new concepts contained therein. Some analysts were disturbed by the necessity for reorganizing their thinking in line with the new structural

theory and the revised theory of anxiety.

The members who returned after being analyzed in Europe, brought back with them a spirited enthusiasm for the spread of psychoanalysis. They stimulated the Society with clinical contributions from their analytical practices. Soon the Society was in ferment. Some members were still agitated about the propositions of the Bad-Homburg International Psychoanalytic Congress. Brill appointed an educational committee in 1927 whose task it was to organize training according to the Bad-Homburg Resolution.

Still undecided was the important matter of which analysts were qualified to be teachers--to train others. The senior members of the Society, who had been analyzing candidates all along, continued to do so, while the new, younger members who returned from analysis in Europe in early 1920 (Meyer, Kardiner, Polon, and Fink), were accepted automatically as teachers and training analysts.

During the period from autumn 1925 until the establishment of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1931, a number of important events took place in New York which helped to further the development of psychoanalysis in America. A well-organized mental hygiene clinic, offering lectures and clinical demonstrations was in operation at Mount Sinai, and in the New York Post Graduate Hospital.

According to historical data, the first federation of analysts and psychiatrists who were interested in analysis, began at Manhattan State Hospital. To name a few of the leading psychiatrists involved: L. Pierce Clark, William Alanson White, Trigant Burrow, Coriat from Boston, Smith Ely Jelliffe met there for clinical discussions under the leadership of the Director, Professor Kirby, who urged the group to begin studying not only the brain in mental and nervous diseases, but also the emotional aspects as delineated by Freud. Later some other analysts - Frink and Frankford Williams joined the group. Together they had a powerful

influence on the development of the New York Psychoanalytic Society.

All the lectures, study groups and informal talks to physicians and other interested people stirred up interest and furthered activities in the teaching of analytically oriented psychotherapy. It seemed the appropriate time for the New School of Social Research to invite Ferenczi, in 1926, as Visiting Professor. His visit proved to be an important step in the development of psychoanalysis in New York. Ferenczi stimulated interest in psychiatric and psychoanalytic thought in medical circles and among the laity.

He gave a weekly series of 90-minute lectures at the New School, and held technical seminars weekly for the analysts, attended by members of the New York Society and the American Psychoanalytic Association. There was much demand by psychiatrists and physicians, who had begun to appreciate the value of analytic knowledge. The laity also sought information about Freud's discoveries.

The American Psychoanalytic Association invited Ferenczi to give a lecture on Christmas Day, 1927, at the McAlpine Hotel. Dr. Harry Stack Sullivan discussed Ferenczi's paper "The Importance of Ego Analysis". Ferenczi also gave another lecture to the New York Neurological Society entitled "Gulliverian Phantasies." Dr. Clarence Oberndorf, then Secretary of the American Psychoanalytic Association, omitted from his report any mention of these lectures. Dr. Oberndorf also left out of his account of analytic activities, the fact that Ferenczi gave technical seminars for analysts which were well-attended by the New York Psychoanalytic Society members.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

What year was that?

That was 1927, the year Stern was President and Oberndorf Secretary of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Oberndorf neglected to mention

those contributions of Ferenczi because he resented Ferenczi's analyzing of non-medical people as part of their training as therapists. Ferenczi's visit was looked upon with suspicion by some New York Society members because he was an advocate of the proposition that non-medical therapists could be trained to conduct analytic therapy.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

Tell me, did you see much of Abraham Brill?

DDR. LORAND:

Very frequently. We were close and I supported his ideas and plans concerning the reorganization and expansion of psychoanalytic activities in New York. Brill was in the midst of controversies which he tried to resolve. He embarked on a plan to organize a psychoanalytic institute, to which end he conferred frequently with Lewin and Kubie. He also spoke to me frequently about his plan to invite Dr. Sandor Rado, whom I knew well from Budapest, to come to New York to organize the institute and become its director. Rado had been analyzed by Ferenczi. I knew about his career in becoming the director of the Internationale Zeitschrift on Ferenczi's recommendation. Brill did invite Rado in 1929. He accepted the invitation at the Oxford Congress and became the Director of the newly formed New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1931.

After Ferenczi's visit, the lay analysis question caused Brill much concern. Heated controversy arose among most of the members of the psychiatric and analytical professions. The excitement about the problem of non-medical people doing psychoanalytic therapy started in 1929. Some American non-medical people had been trained as analytic therapists in Europe. A few were trained in New York by Rank and later by Ferenczi during his visit. However, the American Psychiatric Association whose membership included the psychoanalysts, objected to non-medical people doing therapy. The Chairman of the New York County Medical Society informed the New York Psychoanalytic Society that the Medical Society disapproved of non-medical psychoanalytic practice and of the training of non-medical persons as psychoanalysts (It should be noted that membership in the County Medical Society was a prerequisite for membership in the New York Psychoanalytic Society.) Some of the New York members, including myself, had been sending child and adolescent patients to non-medical child analysts. Their services were greatly needed, yet such referrals were prohibited.

In order to avail themselves of the therapeutic services of their non-medical colleagues, and yet avoid trouble with the County Medical Society, a suggestion given to me by an officer of the Academy of Medicine was followed. Child analysis was to be considered not therapy but psychoanalytic instruction and bills for therapy were to be made out as bills for instruction and thus the issue was skirted, for a while at least.

I took an active part in easing that tension in New York. I continued sending children for therapy to qualified lay child analysts.

In 1929 at the Oxford Congress, the question of lay analysis, which had caused so much disharmony in America was peacefully settled. Brill advocated appointing a committee to deal with the matter. Some of the committee members did not attend the meeting, notably Dr. Clarence Oberndorf and Dr. Adolf Stern. The ones who did were Dr. Eitingon, who was President of the International Psychoanalytic Association, VanOphuijsen, Anna Freud, Princess Bonaparte, Jelliffe, Ferenczi, Brill and myself. It was decided that any American coming to Europe for analysis had to have the endorsement of his local Society if his analysis was later to count as training.

In 1931 the newly organized Psychoanalytic Institute of the New York Psychoanalytic Society began to function under the direction of Dr. Rado. In September of that year, the training courses for future analysts extension courses for social workers, teachers, sociologists, anthropologists and medical doctors were ready to be given.

The actual operation started in three sections: the professional school, the extension school and courses in psychoanalysis for medical doctors. The faculty of the Institute was composed of members of the Society. I gave a course for physicians entitled "Psychoanalysis in Medicine" in association with Dr. George Daniels, Dr. Philip Lehman and Dr. Clarence Oberndorf. I also gave a seminar on "Special Technical Procedures in Special Analytical Situations" which ran for ten sessions. This seminar was given annually and formed the basis of my book, Technique of Psychoanalytic Therapy, published in 1946. Interest in psychoanalysis was evidenced by its publication in England and in Spain, South America and Cuba in Spanish and Portuguese translations.

My lecture, "The Psychoanalytic Approach to Practical Problems of General Medicine" resulted in my being invited by Dr. George Behr, head of the Medical Department of Mount Sinai Hospital, to take part in weekly medical rounds. This marked the initiation of the appointment of liaison psychiatrists to the Medical Department of Mount Sinai. It was the first time a psychiatrist participated in the medical rounds. These rounds began in 1934-35 before Dr. Dunbar's publication of the Journal of Psychosomatic Medicine.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

Dr. Lorand, what was your role in the psychoanalytic movement in New York?

DR. LORAND:

My special entry visa to the United States was due to Professor Kirby's invitation which secured me a teaching position at the Manhattan State Hospital. My assigned role was teaching psychoanalytic theory and technique to psychiatrists and students of medicine.

From the day I arrived in America my role was that of teacher and I began to assist Brill in his lecture courses, and then lectured and taught dynamic psychiatry at the Central Neurological Hospital on Welfare Island. Following that, I taught at the Mount Sinai Neuropsychiatric Division in the Mental Health Clinic, combined with case presentations. Subsequently, Hillside Hospital was founded by Dr. Strauss, Dr. Brill and their associates. At Hillside I had an active role in demonstrating therapeutic methods and lecturing on dynamic psychiatry.

After joining the New York Psychoanalytic Society, my teaching and lecturing was extended to training analysts in the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. I was quite busy teaching psychiatrists who applied to the Society for training. This started at the end of 1925.

It appeared that all psychiatric hospitals endeavored to have on their staffs analytically-trained psychiatrists. This, by the way I heard Freud refer to at the Budapest International Congress in 1918. He observed "that in America, psychoanalysis was already recognized and had made successful inroads into this unexplored region of psychiatry."

Dr. Martin Wanhg, the Editor of a symposium entitled, Fifty Years of Psychoanalysis in New York, published in 1962, described some of the early analysts and their contributions to the expansion and development of psychoanalysis, including mine. He stated ' that my published clinical studies "run the gamut of experience of the psychoanalytic practice," and further stated that as Editor of The Yearbook of Psychoanalysis and of Psychoanalysis Today I had brought together "the most significant psychoanalytic papers of their respective periods."

My early years in New York (the late 20's and early 30's) were involved with activities initiated by members of the New York Society who had gone to Vienna, Berlin, London and Budapest for training and who then organized in New York teaching and training activities which caused much dissension and antagonism on the part of some American psychoanalysts and psychiatrists. In 1930, when the First Mental Hygiene Congress met in Washington, a number of European psychoanalysts came to America to participate

in the meeting. Shortly after the Congress European analysts began to emigrate to America. They settled mainly in New York and contributed to the progress of psychoanalysis through their lectures, teaching and training of analytical candidates. However, their competitive and rivalrous feelings caused some difficulties and much dissatisfaction with the American way of analytic

practice. Some of the immigrant colleagues behaved as if they believed themselves to be the protectors of the purity of Freudian doctrine and classical analysis. On many occasions I also was involved in the controversies they stirred up.

I was appointed lecturer at -Columbia and in 1931 Professor Kirby attempted to establish a psychoanalytic clinic at Columbia's Psychiatric Institute where I was invited to work. Unfortunately I could not leave the Mount Sinai Clinic but I continued lecturing at the Institute.

Kirby did establish the first psychoanalytic Clinic at Columbia University in 1931. It was the first clinic which attempted to teach psychoanalytic therapy in a university's medical school.

Dr. Monroe Meyer and Dr. Kardiner worked in the clinic, but after a year it ceased to function because of the dearth of cases suitable for analytic therapy. It was, however, a pioneering venture, the forerunner of the realization at some future date of Freud's suggestion that psychoanalysis be taught in universities.

PROFESSOR KOLB:

There is one area that interests us a great deal and that is about the beginning of psychoanalytic education in Long Island State University. How did that come about?

DR. LORAND:

You are referring to my most cherished achievement! I believed that psychoanalysis should be taught in universities. Columbia University established a psychoanalytic clinic for training and research, after Professor Kirby's attempt failed. I was aware of Freud's 1918 article, "Why Psychoanalysis Should be Taught in Universities." And after World War II, psychoanalytically-trained psychiatrists were eagerly sought by some medical schools, psychiatric hospitals and veterans administration hospitals as a result of the splendid therapeutic services rendered to our armed forces during the war. (Oberndorf aptly observed that World War II had put psychoanalysis on the map.)

In the 40's Brill and I lectured regularly at the Psychiatric Division of Bellevue Hospital. About 1947, Dr. Samuel B. Wortis, Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at Bellevue Hospital, who years earlier had had personal analysis with me and also some supervision with Dr. Brill, invited me to organize a psychoanalytic clinic and training center at Bellevue Hospital. There already were some analyzed psychiatrists in its psychiatric department.

Brill was very much in favor of establishing a psychoanalytic training center. I consulted with Adolf Stern, then Chairman of the Educational Committee at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, and with other members of the Educational Committee. My plan was to enlist the participation of the Educational Committee in the Bellevue program and I succeeded in organizing a group of analytic teachers consisting of Brill, Henry Bunker, Rene Spitz, Van Ophuijsen and Paul Schilder.

It soon became apparent, however, from discussions with Dr. Wortis that the content of analytic teaching would be too dependent upon the attitude and policies of the Department of Psychiatry. Therefore we all agreed to abandon the project.

Dr. Howard W. Potter, Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at the State University of New York, Downstate Medical Center, was in close contact with Dr. Brill and had developed a very fine psychiatric department. One member, Dr. Richard L. Frank, Potter called "the mainstay of the newly initiated residency program."

A number of well-known analysts had already lectured in the psychiatric program. Among them were Brill, Bunker, Adler, Federn, Kardiner, Lewin, Sperling, Wittels, Rado, Van Ophuijsen and myself. Dr. Potter was deeply interested in psychoanalysis and so the psychiatrists in his department initiated a plan for a program of psychoanalytic training. Drs. Brill and Frank appraised the plan and asked me to discuss it with Dr. Potter.

The discussion resulted in Dr. Potter's invitation to me to organize a full scale training program. Further, he expressed the wish to establish as soon as possible, a graduate school for psychoanalytic medicine. The proposal was for a three-year graduate course in psychoanalytic medicine to be established within the Department of Psychiatry. Thus was born the autonomous Psychoanalytic Division in the Department of Psychiatry. Enthusiasm for the new division was expressed by the basic science faculty, the clinical faculty, the administration and the trustees, who gave their approval for a graduate course in psychoanalytic education. The approval included that of Jean A Curran, President of the Long Island College of Medicine, the faculty, and the Dean, Duncan Clark.

By January 1949 the psychoanalytic teaching program was in full swing and we had been accredited as a Training Center by the American Psychoanalytic Association. Three years later when we applied to the American for Institute status, it was granted, but only after a long, acrimonious debate. The debate was terminated by M. Ralph Kaufman, past President of the American Psychoanalytic who rose at the meeting of the Board of Professional Standards and told those who objected that they were talking nonsense. In the spring of 1952 we became a fully accredited institute of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

Dr. I. Charles Kaufman, who became Chairman and Director of the Psychiatric Department, provided important help in expanding the psychoanalytic program. In 1961 he helped me to establish the program of advanced studies in psychoanalysis, which included groups of topics, discussions of which were led by various members of the faculty. This program was highly regarded and became extremely popular. Various psychoanalytic societies established similar programs.

When our young analysts finished their training and graduated from the Institute at the Downstate Medical Center, they sought membership in the New York Psychoanalytic Society, a necessary step at that time, to becoming members eventually of the American Psychoanalytic. Our graduates, however,, were refused membership by the New York Society and instead were advised that they should first have additional supervision by an analyst from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute!

This development prompted me to apply for a separate Society charter from the American. In 1955 we requested Dr. Ives Hendrick, then President of the American Psychoanalytic Association, to grant us the charter, noting the difficulties our graduates experienced in attempting to become members of the New York Psychoanalytic Society. (The New York Psychoanalytic would not even rent our student their auditorium for scientific presentations although the need for additional funds was pressing.)

We received the charter. Our Society was named The Psychoanalytic Association of New York. Further, in view of our experiences, Dr. Hendricks arranged for a new ruling permitting graduates of all recognized Institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association to join the American without prior local Society affiliation.

In connection with the matter of university teaching of psychoanalysis, you may find it of interest that in the early 40's, the Professor and Chairman of the Pysyciatric Department at Yale, Professor Redlich, gave permission for two of his residents who wanted to be analytically trained, to apply to the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. However, he could only allow them three afternoons off per week. The two candidates were D.r. Maudie Marie Burns and Dr. Herman Shlionsky. (Dr. Burns is now on the faculty of the University of Texas. Dr. Shlionsky later founded (in 1959) the New Jersey Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.) Redlich referred them to me.

I could not begin analysis with these two psychiatrists without the consent of the Educational Committee of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Initially the Educational Committee's response was a rigid adherence to the training regulation which stipulated a mandatory five analytic sessions per week. After a long argument I finally persuaded the Committee to permit the two psychiatrists to become analytic candidates. They were accepted as students with the special proviso that they could be analyzed on a three hour per week schedule.

This was a significant step in the direction of greater flexibility in psychoanalytic training under special conditions. From then on, the practice of three weekly sessions was accepted as a minimum requirement. Later, when our group was organized at the Downstate Medical Center, it was left to the candidate to decide whether to have four analytical

hours per week or three.

PROF. KOLB:

I am very interested in your role regarding the psychoanalytic development and the spread of psychoanalysis. How did this come about?

DR. LORAND:

It just happened that I was, so to speak, forced to take on certain roles when it came to the problems confronting psychoanalytic development. Dr. Brill was lecturing on psychoanalysis and urged me to join him. This was the beginning and my involvement flowed from it.

Another situation in which I was involved for years was the early phase of the attempted organization of the Panamerican Psychoanalytic Association. These events are recorded in Psychoanalysis in the Americas, Edited by Robert E. Litman (International Universities Press) published in 1966. My specific role chiefly concerned the beginning years.

Dr. Angel Garma who was trained at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute in 1931, first practiced in Spain and from there immigrated to South America, via France.

Dr. Garma came to New York in 1944, planning to effect closer contact between the American Psychoanalytic Association and the South American Psychoanalytic Societies. He talked to me about it at length and I suggested to him that he contact Bertram D. Lewin, who was later to become the President of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Both Lewin and I were very much in favor of Garma's objective. Lewin promised him cooperation and even held out the possibility that the Argentine Association would become a member society of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

When Lewin became President in 1956, however, he failed to come through on his promise. He later told me that this was because he was attacked from many sides, especially by the Councils of various Societies and

their Presidents. Sadly and with great disgust, he eventually gave up on his efforts.

Dr. Garma turned to me again to discuss his plans and asked for my guidance and opinion, knowing that I was in close contact with Lewin. I identified with Garma and his problems because I had had a somewhat similar experience when I came to America in 1925. I had excellent credentials, had been analyzed by Ferenczi, supervised, attended clinical conferences, was associate member of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society and by special invitation had come to America to teach analysis, yet, in 1926, when I asked to transfer my membership to the New York Society (mind you, at that time there were no training analysts in New York, no training seminars, and all members of the Society could train other analysts), I was told by Oberndorf that "in America we don't recognize transferring of membership from a European Psychoanalytic Society to ours. But as both Societies belong to the International Psychoanalytic Association, I suggest you present a paper." I sarcastically asked him how many clinical papers he would require of me before finding me worthy of membership.

Dr. Garma was in touch with me from the time he first approached Dr. Lewin. We met repeatedly and discussed the failure of his plans. I suggested that he arrange a Latin-American Psychoanalytic meeting independently and at a time when it would not conflict with the International Psychoanalytic Congress which is held every two years. I further advised that he invite all the members of the International.

I requested of Garma a detailed account of his plans and also of Lewin's promises and failures, assuring him that I would bring the entire matter to the attention of the current President of the American Psychoanalytic Association, Dr. Maxwell Gittelson. Garma gave me the information and also listed the members of the New York and American Psychoanalytic Associations who, at the previous Geneva Psychoanalytic Congress, had

given their word that if the Panamerican Congress were undertaken, they would assist in its establishment. Those whose names appeared on the list were: Leo H. Bartemeier, Edmund Bergler, Grete L. Bibring, Berta Bernstein, Thomas M. French, Ives Hendricks, Edith Jacobson, M. Ralph Kaufman, Robert P. Knight, Rudolph M. Loewenstein, Bertram Lewin, William C. Menninger, Paul Sloane, Rene A. Spitz, Edith Weigert, Gregory Kilboorg.

Dr. Gittelsohn spoke favorably of the PanAmerican Congress and promised to take up the matter after the conclusion of the American Psychoanalytic meeting in New York. (A summary of all those discussions and promises is contained in a letter which Garma sent me on November 2, 1955.) When Garma and I met briefly again I urged him to act immediately on the Latin-American Congress in South America.

Dr. Gittelsohn appointed me Chairman of a Committee to investigate the problems concerning South America and the possibility of arranging the PanAmerican Congress. Dr. Gittelsohn was very much in favor of the separate Latin American Congress which was to be held in Buenos Aires in 1956. That Congress, however, never took place.

In 1957 Garma again visited me. His Committee suggested that the Latin American Congress be held in Brazil or Argentina. Some members of the New York Society privately suggested Cuba because for the American analyst it was more economical and convenient. I strongly emphasized to Garma my opinion that he shouldn't change his plan to have his Latin American Congress in South America and not be swayed by the New Yorkers. The Congress was held in Brazil in 1958.

Dr. Gittelsohn and his wife, Francis, who was President of the Chicago Psychoanalytic Association, attended the Fourth Latin American Congress, which was held in Rio de Janeiro in 1962. Dr. Gittelsohn then appointed a permanent committee to help in every way towards the establishment of a PanAmerican Psychoanalytic Association. Among the committee members were Dr. Knight, Dr. Lewin and Dr. Arnaldo Rascovsky.

During the preceding years the size and activities of the Latin-American Psychoanalytic Association had been greatly increased by the incorporation of groups from Rio, Mexico, Montevideo, Chile and Sao Paulo.

Dr. Gittelsohn's visit to the Fourth Congress in Ro had a decisive effect in furthering the development of the PanAmerican Congress. Dr. Gittelsohn, who was a most gracious, amiable and eminently fair-minded gentleman, visited a number of South American Societies, lectured and conferred with members at conferences, spreading good-will and enthusiasm, as well as a spirit of cooperation.

At long last, in 1964, Dr. Garma's plan for a PanAmerican Congress was realized. It took place in Mexico. It began with a fair amount of discord in evidence. There were objections on the part of the North Americans to the Kleinian approach in theory and technique by which the South American analysts were strongly influenced, and there was concern voiced again about possible adulteration of basic Freudian principles.

Gradually, as the exchange of opinions and the verbalization of concerns progressed, greater understanding developed among many participants and there was a changed perception of each other's position. A reduction of hostility and a rapprochement of views took place to a degree which permitted friendly relations and the goal of working together for the future of psychoanalytic development among a good proportion of the participants.